From: Ginsberg, Gary

To: dhattis@(b) (6); Ravi Subramaniam/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: Jennifer Jinot/DC/USEPA/US@EPA; KennyCrump@email.com; Paul White/DC/USEPA/US@EPA; Chao

Chen/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject: RE: paper on NAS review
Date: 06/08/2011 12:27 AM
Attachments: Subraman Lett June 2011.doc

Ravi - I like this response to NAS and think it would be best placed as a commentary rather than a letter to the editor. If this journal doesn't print commentaries you may want to consider another one because some (like EHP) do so. In fact EHP published a commentary from me and Deb Rice several yrs ago about a different NAS report. My comments are in track changes attached - in addition, as you are describing MO-M5 in Figs 1 and 2, you may want to put in the Connolly hockey stick assumed slope - my initial assumption was that MO would be the baseline run of Connolly but that is obviously wrong but not clear what that would look like. I also think it needs short direct rebuttal statements to the NAS points as they are brought up and then have your explanations follow. My coauthorship on this would seem superfluous but I don't object to being listed as such. Gary

From: dhattis@aol.com [dhattis@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, June 06, 2011 12:36 PM
To: Subramaniam.Ravi@epamail.epa.gov
Cc: Ginsberg, Gary; Jinot.Jennifer@epamail.epa.gov; KennyCrump@email.com; White.Paul@epamail.epa.gov; Chen.Chao@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Re: paper on NAS review

Dear Ravi.

Attached are some minor editing comments on you draft. I don't mind being included as a co-author, but I think my contributions could be adequately covered in an acknowledgement.

Best wishes,

Dale

----Original Message---From: Chen.Chao@epamail.epa.gov
To: Subramani
Cc: dhattis@ab (6 Gary.Ginsberg@po.state.ct.us; Jinot.Jennifer@epamail.epa.gov;
KennyCrump@em (5 White.Paul@epamail.epa.gov)
Sent: Mon, Jun 6, 2011 12:03 pm
Subject: Re: paper on NAS review

Hi Ravi:

The draft looks very good. I wish we can invite the NAS panelists who made comments, in particular the Com #1 to debate. I have made some comments in the text (attached below).

Chac

(See attached file: Chao-Letter.re.NASreview.docx)

From: Ravi Subramaniam/DC/USEPA/US
To: KennyCrump@email.com<mailto:KennyCrump@ om>, Paul White A/US@EPA, Jennifer Jinot/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, dhattis@(b) (6) <mailto:dhattis(b) (6) / cmailto:dhattis(b) (6) / cmailto:dhattis(b)

Attached is a paper that Kenny and I have been working on which is a response to the NAS comments on the use of the Conolly et al. BBDR modeling for EPA's formaldehyde risk assessment. This is an initial draft. Please send Kenny and me your comments and suggestions for improvement. Please confirm that you would like to be co-authors on this. Figures are in the attached powerpoint file. Also your suggestion as to where it could be submitted. We were thinking we could submit it as a letter to the editor in the Annals of Occup Hygiene where our previous paper and exchange with Conolly appeared. It has become kind of long now, so it could possibly stand as a paper on its own.

Rawi

Ravi Subramaniam Environmental Health Scientist NCEA-Washington, ORD, EPA N-7934, Two Potomac Yard, Crystal City (703) 347-8606, (301) 515-2701 (alternate office)

(7,00, 51, 0000**)** (301, 510 2701 (dittermine office)

[attachment "Figures rev2.pptx" deleted by Chao Chen/DC/USEPA/US] [attachment "Letter.re.NASreview.docx" deleted by Chao Chen/DC/USEPA/US]